

**REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS NO. A/TP/665 and A/TP/666  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) - Small Houses)  
in “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Village Type Development” (“V”) Zones  
Lots 187 S.B. and S.C. in D.D. 21, San Uk Ka Village, Tai Po, New Territories**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 29.5.2019, the following applicants sought planning permission to build a house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) at each of the application sites (the Sites) under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

Application No.	Applicant	Site Area	Zonings of Application Site	
A/TP/665	Mr. MAH Chen Ying	about 202.1m <sup>2</sup>	“V” (29%)	“GB” (71%)
A/TP/666	Mr. MAH Chen Sing represented by Mr. MAH Chen Ying	about 164m <sup>2</sup>	“V” (42%)	“GB” (58%)

- 1.2 On 19.7.2019, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the applications and the reasons for each application were:
- (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission to justify a departure from the planning intention; and
  - (b) land is still available within the “V” zone of San Uk Ka, Cheung Uk Tei, Sheung Wun Yiu and Ha Wun Yiu which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.
- 1.3 For Members’ reference, the following documents are attached:

- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/665 & 666 (Annex A)
- (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 19.7.2019 (Annex B)

(c) Secretary of the Board's letters dated 2.8.2019

(Annex C)

**2. Application for Review**

On 21.8.2019, Mr. MAH Chen Ying, who was the applicant of Application No. A/TP/665 and the applicant's representative of Application No. A/TP/666, applied under section 17(1) of the Ordinance for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the applications (**Annex D1**). A written representation submitted by a representative of the applicants in support of the review application was received by the Board on 22.10.2019 (**Annex D2**).

**3. Justifications from the Applicants**

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the review application are detailed in the letter at **Annex D2**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) the applications are in compliance with criterion (c) of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB-PG No. 10) for 'Application for Development within "Green Belt" zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' in that the Sites are in close proximity to existing village cluster of San Uk Ka and are located in between the existing village cluster and domestic structures in the "GB" zone; the proposed developments are compatible with surrounding uses; and are to meet the demand from indigenous villagers;
- (b) the applications are totally in line with the assessment criterion (b) of the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) in that more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprints fall within the "V" zone and there is a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the "V" zone of San Uk Ka Village;
- (c) the estimation of land available within the "V" zone for Small House developments has been overestimated, which has included government land on which LandsD would not process Small House applications by private treaty grants or land exchange in accordance with the High Court Judgement of the Judicial Review on Small House Policy, odd-shaped land that could not reasonably accommodate the footprint of a Small House, and land currently occupied by roads, footpaths and tracks; and
- (d) there are no large tree within the Sites. The proposed developments would only involve clearance of weeds and some banana trees with no significant impact on existing landscape resources. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD), Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Director of Agriculture, Fisheries & Conservation (DAFC) have no objection to/ no strong view on the applications.

#### 4. **The Section 16 Applications**

##### **The Sites and Their Surrounding Areas** (Plans R-1 and R-2a, and photos on Plans R-4a and R-4b)

- 4.1 The situation of the Sites and their surrounding areas at the time of consideration of the s.16 applications by the RNTPC were described in paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2 of **Annex A**. There has been no material change of the situation since then.
- 4.2 The Sites are:
- (a) flat, currently vacant and covered by grasses and groundcovers;
  - (b) outside the village 'environs' ('VE') of San Uk Ka Village; and
  - (c) located at the south-eastern fringe of San Uk Ka Village.
- 4.3 The surrounding areas are predominantly rural in character with a mix of village houses, active and fallow agricultural land and scattered tree groups. The village cluster of San Uk Ka is situated about 5 to 10m to the northwest.

##### **Planning Intentions**

- 4.4 The planning intention of the "GB" zone is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone.
- 4.5 The planning intention of the "V" zone is to designate both existing recognized villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within this zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. It is also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.

##### **Assessment Criteria**

- 4.6 The set of Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) was first promulgated on 24.11.2000 and had been amended four times on 30.3.2001, 23.8.2002, 21.3.2003 and 7.9.2007. The latest set of Interim Criteria promulgated on 7.9.2007 is at Appendix II of **Annex A**.

##### **Town Planning Board Guidelines**

- 4.7 The Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB-PG No. 10) for 'Application for Development within "Green Belt" zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance', which is relevant to the consideration of the s.16

applications, is still effective. The relevant assessment criteria of the Guidelines are summarised in paragraph 5 of **Annex A**.

Previous Application

4.8 There is no previous application at the Sites.

Similar Applications

- 4.9 When the s.16 applications were considered by the RNTPC on 19.7.2019, there were 42 similar applications (No. A/TP/266, 274, 278, 282, 286, 287, 300, 302, 303, 320, 353, 363, 380, 424, 425, 464 to 477, 525, 553 to 556, 561, 562, 566, 570 to 572, 641 and 662) for Small House development in the vicinity of the Sites and within the same “GB” zone since the first promulgation of the Interim Criteria on 24.11.2000 (**Plan R-1**), of which 40 were approved and two were rejected. There has been no change in the number of similar applications since then.
- 4.10 Between 2000 and March 2015, before the Board’s adoption of a more cautious approach in approving applications for Small House development in August 2015, a total of 39 applications were approved with conditions and one application was rejected by the Committee. The 39 applications were approved mainly on the grounds that the proposed developments were in line with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint was located within the ‘VE’/“V” zone; there was a general shortage of land in the concerned “V” zone to meet the demand for Small House development at the time of consideration; and/or the application site was the subject of previously approved application.
- 4.11 Application No. A/TP/562 was rejected in 2014 mainly on considerations of being not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone; and not complying with TPB-PG No.10 and the Interim Criteria in that the proposed development would involve clearance of existing natural vegetation and affect the stability of the adjacent slope. Subsequently, the same applicant submitted another application (No. A/TP/641) with slight changes in site area and disposition of the proposed Small House and supplemented with a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) to address the concerns on slope stability. This application was approved in 2018 mainly on the grounds that the proposed development was generally in line with the TPB-PG No.10 in that it would not cause adverse geotechnical impact; and was in close proximity to existing Small Houses and a cluster of approved Small House applications.
- 4.12 Application (No. A/TP/662) was rejected on 3.5.2019 mainly for the reasons that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone; it was not complying with TPB-PG No.10 and the Interim Criteria in that the proposed development would involve clearance of existing natural vegetation; and land was still available within the “V” zone of the villages concerned which was primarily intended for Small House development. The applicant of Application No. A/TP/662 has submitted a review application,

which will be considered by the Board in due course.

- 4.13 Details of the above applications are summarized in **Annex E** and their locations are shown on **Plans R-1** and **R-2a**.

**5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 5.1 Comments on the s.16 applications made by relevant Government departments are stated in paragraph 10 and Appendix IV of **Annex A**.
- 5.2 For the review application, relevant Government department has been further consulted and his views on the review application are summarized as follows:

Land Administration

- 5.2.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (DLO/TP, LandsD):

- (a) the number of outstanding Small House applications for San Uk Ka, Cheung Uk Tei, Sheung Wun Yiu and Ha Wun Yiu is 41 and the 10-year Small House demand forecast for the villages concerned is 274. These two figures provided at the s.16 application stage are still up-to-date; and
- (b) he maintains his other previous views on the s.16 applications which are recapitulated below:
  - (i) no objection to the applications;
  - (ii) the applicants are indigenous villagers of Wun Yiu Village of Tai Po as confirmed by the respective Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR), but their eligibility of Small House grant has yet to be ascertained;
  - (iii) the Sites are not covered by Modification of Tenancy or Building Licence;
  - (iv) the subject lots are held under Block Government Leases demised for agricultural use. Small House applications submitted by the same applicants for the Sites are still under processing;
  - (v) if and after planning approval has been given by the Board, his office will process the Small House applications. However, there is no guarantee at this stage that the Small House applications would be approved. If the Small House applications are approved by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion, such approvals

will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD. Please also note that there is no guarantee to the grant of a right of way to the Small Houses concerned or approval of the emergency vehicular access thereto;

- (vi) the Sites entirely fall outside the village 'environs' of San Uk Ka Village; and
- (vii) the High Court ruled on 8.4.2019 and confirmed in the orders granted on 30.4.2019 that the private treaty grant and land exchange arrangements involving government land under the Small House policy were unconstitutional. Processing of private treaty grant and land exchange for Small House on government land has been suspended.

5.3 The following Government departments have no further comments on the review application and maintain their previous views on the s.16 applications in Appendix IV of **Annex A**, which are recapitulated as follows:

Traffic

5.3.1 Comments of Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) in general, he has reservation on the applications. Such type of development should be confined within the "V" zone as far as possible. Although additional traffic generated by the proposed developments is not expected to be significant, such type of development outside the "V" zone, if permitted, will set an undesirable precedent case for similar applications in the future. The resulting cumulative adverse traffic impact could be substantial;
- (b) notwithstanding the above, he considers that the applications only involving development of two Small Houses can be tolerated on traffic grounds; and
- (c) the existing village access on and near the Sites are not under Transport Department's management. It is suggested that the land status, management and maintenance responsibilities of the village access should be clarified with the relevant lands and maintenance authorities accordingly in order to avoid potential land disputes.

Environment

5.3.2 Comments of Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) no objection to the applications; and

- (b) if the applications are approved, the applicants should be advised that the septic tank and soakaway system is an acceptable means for collection, treatment and disposal of the sewage provided that its design and construction follow the requirements of the Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC) PN 5/93 “Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department” and are duly certified by an Authorized Person.

#### Landscape

##### 5.3.3 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

- (a) no objection to the applications from the landscape planning point of view;
- (b) the Sites are situated in an area of rural landscape character comprising scattered tree groups and village houses. The proposed developments are considered not incompatible with the surrounding environment;
- (c) the Sites are vacant and covered with grasses and groundcovers. One existing Citrus *Limonia* (黎檬) in fair condition entwined with climbers is found within the site boundary of Application No. A/TP/665. Significant adverse impact arising from the proposed developments on landscape resources within the Sites is not anticipated; and
- (d) in view of that the Sites are not bounded by prominent public frontage, should the applications be approved by the Board, it is considered not necessary to impose any landscape condition as its effect on public realm quality enhancement is not apparent.

#### Drainage and Sewerage

##### 5.3.4 Comments of Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD):

- (a) no in-principle objection to the applications from public drainage viewpoint;
- (b) there is no public drain maintained by DSD in the vicinity of the Sites. Should the applications be approved by the Board, a condition should be included to request the applicants to submit and implement the drainage proposal for the Sites to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services to ensure that they will not cause adverse drainage impact to the surrounding areas and the residential premises located at their downhill side;

- (c) the proposed Small Houses should have their own stormwater collection and discharge systems to cater for the runoff generated within the Sites and their uphill overland flow. The applicants/owners are also required to maintain such systems properly and rectify the systems if they are found to be inadequate or ineffective during operation. The applicants/owners shall also be liable for and shall indemnify claims and demands arising out of damage or nuisance caused by failure of the systems;
- (d) the applicants should design the drainage proposal based on actual site condition for DSD's comment/agreement. In the design, the applicants should consider the workability, the drainage impact to the surrounding environment and seek comments from all concerned parties/departments if necessary. The applicants/owners should ensure no adverse drainage and geotechnical impact will be caused to the area due to the proposed developments. The proposed developments, located on unpaved ground and slope area, will increase the impervious area resulting in a change of the flow pattern and an increase of the surface runoff and thus the flooding risk to surrounding areas and the residential premises located at their downhill side. The applicants should take this into account when preparing the drainage proposal. The existing natural streams, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas should not be adversely affected. In particular, a minimum clearance of 3m between the proposed developments and the nearest extremity of the existing streamcourse/ pond/ river/ the top of embankment should be maintained;
- (e) public sewers are available in the vicinity of the proposed developments but connection to which might not be feasible. Views and comments from the DEP should be sought regarding the sewage disposal arrangement of the proposed developments;
- (f) the proposed drainage works, whether within or outside the lot boundary, should be constructed and maintained by the lot owners at their expense. For works to be undertaken outside the lot boundaries, prior consent and agreement from DLO/TP of LandsD and/or relevant private lot owner(s) should be sought;
- (g) the site formation levels of the proposed developments shall not cause flooding risk to nearby area/premises. Comments/agreement from DLO/TP of LandsD for the finished site formation level should be sought; and
- (h) the applicants/owners should take all precautionary measures to prevent any disturbance, damage and pollution from the



developments to any parts of the existing drainage facilities in the vicinity of the lots. In the event of any damage to the existing drainage facilities, the lot owner/developer would be held responsible for the cost of all necessary repair works, compensation and any other consequences arising therefrom.

Agriculture

5.3.5 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries & Conservation (DAFC) :

- has no strong view on the applications as the Sites are overgrown with common shrub and herbs.

Fire Safety

5.3.6 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) no comment on the applications;
- (b) the applicants are advised to observe the 'New Territories Exempted Houses – A Guide to Fire Safety Requirements' published by LandsD; and
- (c) detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal application referred by LandsD.

Water Supply

5.3.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD):

- (a) no objection to the applications; and
- (b) for provision of water supply to the developments, the applicants may need to extend their inside services to the nearest suitable Government water mains for connection. The applicants shall resolve any land matter (such as private lots) associated with the provision of water supply and shall be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to WSD's standards.

5.4 The following Government departments have no further comment on the review application and maintain their previous views of having no comment on/ no objection to the s.16 applications:

- (a) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD);

- (b) Project Manager/North, Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/N, CEDD);
- (c) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD);
- (d) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Service (DEMS); and
- (e) District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department (DO(TP), HAD).

**6. Public Comments on the Review Application Received During Statutory Publication Period (Annex F)**

- 6.1 On 30.8.2019 and 22.11.2019, the review application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection periods, four public comments from Designing Hong Kong Ltd, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, WWF-HK and an individual were received raising objection mainly on the grounds of being not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone; development in “GB” zone and the use of septic tank will have adverse impacts on the environment; village house development should be located close to the village proper; and approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent.
- 6.2 Two public comments were received at the s.16 application stage for each of the applications. All public comments were against the applications. Details are set out in paragraph 11 of **Annex A**.

**7. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 7.1 The subject applications for Small House development were rejected by the RNTPC on 19.7.2019 on the grounds of being not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone; and land was still available within the “V” zone of San Uk Ka, Cheung Uk Tei, Sheung Wun Yiu and Ha Wun Yiu for Small House development.
- 7.2 To support the review application, the applicants have put forward justifications that the applications complied with TPB PG-No. 10 in that the proposed NTEH developments are in close proximity to existing villages and in keeping with the surrounding uses; are to meet the demand from indigenous villagers; no adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed developments is expected; and relevant Government departments have no objection to the applications. They also argue that the applications complied with the Interim Criteria in that there is a shortage of land in the “V” zone for Small House development as PlanD has overestimated the land available (by including odd-shaped land that could not accommodate the footprint of a Small House, and land currently occupied by roads, footpaths and tracks), and counted the government land in the “V” zone even LandsD would not process Small House applications by private treaty grants or land exchange in accordance with the High Court Judgement of the Judicial Review on the Small House Policy.

- 7.3 Majority of the Sites are zoned “GB” on the Tai Po OZP. The proposed Small House developments are not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. No strong planning justification has been given by the applicants for a departure from this planning intention.
- 7.4 The applicants reiterate that the applications were in compliance with the TPB-PG No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within the “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’. The Sites, located on the southern fringe of San Uk Ka village cluster, are currently vacant and covered by grasses and groundcovers. In this regard, DAFC and CTP/UD&L of PlanD have no strong view on/ no objection to the applications from nature conservation and landscape planning points of view respectively. C for T has general reservation on the applications but considers that the applications involving development of two Small Houses only can be tolerated on traffic grounds. Besides, DEP has no adverse comment on the proposed use of septic tank for sewage treatment. Other relevant Government departments including CE/MN of DSD, CE/C of WSD, CHE/NTE of HyD and D of FS have no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications. Notwithstanding that the proposed developments are not expected to have significant adverse environmental, traffic, geotechnical, drainage and sewerage impacts, those developments still do not comply with assessment criterion (a) that there is a general presumption against development in the “GB” zone.
- 7.5 In the review application, the applicants also argue that the available land within the “V” zone as estimated by PlanD are not accurate as those land areas occupied by access road/footpath/local track as well as land of irregular shape being unable to accommodate a Small House development are not excluded from the estimation. In this regard, it should be noted that in estimating the land available for Small House development in “V” zone, PlanD has adopted a consistent approach and would make use of the latest available information. In general, the land occupied by road, existing and approved village houses, steep slope, major tree clusters and stream buffer will be deducted from the area available for Small House development. Moreover, odd-shaped land that could not reasonably accommodate the footprint of a Small House will also be discounted.
- 7.6 Besides, the applicants also state that as LandsD would not process the Small House applications for private treaty grants or land exchange in accordance with the High Court Judgement of the Judicial Review on the Small House Policy, the government land in the “V” zone should not be counted as available land for Small House development. It should be noted that the said High Court Judgement relates to the Small House Policy implemented by LandsD, the judgement does not affect the Board’s functions under the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap 131) (TPO). Pursuant to section 16 of the TPO, the Board shall consider applications for planning permission for Small House development, and decide whether to grant or refuse planning permission taking

into account the relevant planning considerations and land ownership is not a material consideration.

- 7.7 Based on the latest estimate by the PlanD, about 2.34 ha of land (equivalent to about 93 Small House sites) is available within the “V” zone of concerned villages (**Plan R-2b**). Although land available within the “V” zone is insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand of 315 Small Houses, such available land (about 2.34 ha or equivalent to 93 Small House sites) is capable to meet the 41<sup>1</sup> outstanding Small House applications. According to a more cautious approach adopted by the Board in August 2015, in considering whether there is a general shortage of land in meeting Small House demand, more weighting has been put on the number of outstanding Small House applications provided by LandsD. As such, it is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House developments within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. As there is no significant change in planning circumstances since the applications were rejected by RNTPC, there is no strong reason to depart from the RNTPC’s previous decision.
- 7.8 Although there are seven similar approved applications within the same “GB” zone in close proximity to the Sites, they were all approved before the Board’s adoption of the more cautious approach in August 2015. The planning circumstances of the review application are therefore different from those approved similar applications.
- 7.9 Regarding the public comments objecting to the review application on the grounds as detailed in paragraph 6 above, Government departments’ comments and the planning assessments above are relevant.

## **8. Planning Department’s Views**

- 8.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 7, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 6 and given that there is no major change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject applications by the RNTPC, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review application for the following reasons:
- (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission to justify a departure from the planning intention; and

<sup>1</sup> Among the 41 outstanding Small House applications, 21 of them fall within the “V” zone and 20 straddle or outside the “V” zone. For those 20 applications straddling or being outside the “V” zone, six of them have obtained valid planning approval from the Board.

- (b) land is still available within the “V” zone of San Uk Ka, Cheung Uk Tei, Sheung Wun Yiu and Ha Wun Yiu which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.

8.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that each of the permissions shall be valid until **10.1.2024**, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members’ reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex G**.

**9. Decision Sought**

- 9.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for review of the RNTPC’s decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicants.
- 9.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, Members are invited to consider the approval conditions and advisory clauses, if any, to be attached to each of the permissions, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.

**10. Attachments**

<b>Plan R-1</b>	Location plan
<b>Plan R-2a</b>	Site plan
<b>Plan R-2b</b>	Estimated amount of land available for Small House development within “V” zone

<b>Plan R-3</b>	Aerial photo
<b>Plans R-4a &amp; 4b</b>	Site photos
<b>Annex A</b>	RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/665&666
<b>Annex B</b>	Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 19.7.2019
<b>Annex C</b>	Secretary of the Board's letters dated 2.8.2019
<b>Annex D1</b>	Letter received by the Board on 21.8.2019 applying for a review of the RNTPC's decision
<b>Annex D2</b>	Written representation submitted by the applicant's representative received on 22.10.2019
<b>Annex E</b>	Similar applications
<b>Annex F</b>	Public comments
<b>Annex G</b>	Recommended advisory clauses

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**JANUARY 2020**

**TPB Paper No. 10614**

**For Consideration by  
the Town Planning Board on 10.1.2020**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS NO. A/TP/665 & 666  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses)  
in “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones  
Lots 187 S.B and S.C in D.D.21, San Uk Ka Village, Tai Po, New Territories**